

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

As suggested by the Examiner, the specification has been amended to include a section entitled “Cross Reference to Related Applications” for the purpose of listing earlier filed International Patent Application No. PCT/DE03/03187, filed September 24, 2003, and German Patent Application No. DE 102 52 180.8, filed November 9, 2002, upon which the present application is based.

Claims 1-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter because of the inclusion of the phrase “in the direction of the vehicle occupant” recited in Claim 1. Claim 1 has been amended to delete this phrase and replace it with the phrase “in a rearward direction of the vehicle,” as suggested by the Examiner.

Claims 1-16 also stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement on the basis that the recitation in claim 1 that the driving device moves the stowage container together with the impact lid between the retracted passive position and the extended open position is not described in the specification. On page 12, line 2, the specification has been supplemented by adding the sentence “The driving device 4 also moves the glove compartment’s stowage container 7 between the retracted closed position and the extended open position.” This addition to the specification is taken from the recitation in claim 1 as filed and thus does not constitute “new matter.” This feature of the claimed invention is described in the specification on page 8, second paragraph, wherein it is stated that “the adjustment movement of the dust (stowage) container 7 takes place with the same driving device 4 as the adjustment of the impact lid 2 and secondly can be performed together with the impact lid 2.” See specification, page 8, lines 10-14. The detailed description of the movement of the impact lid 2 and the stowage container 7, which are both extended and retracted by the driving

device 4, is provided in the specification on page 11, line 12-page 13, line 2, with reference to FIG. 5.

Claims 1-14 also stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for use of the phrase “in particular” in claim 1. Therefore, the phrase “in particular” has been deleted from claim 1 by virtue of the present amendment.

With this amendment, all of the pending claims are believed to be patentable and reconsideration and allowance of these claims is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: AUGUST 30, 2007

Thomas E. Hill

Thomas E. Hill, Reg. No. 28,955
Attorney for Applicant
Wildman, Harrold, Allen & Dixon LLP
225 West Wacker Drive
Chicago, Illinois 60606-1229
Tel: 312-201-2026
Fax: 312-416-4851
E-Mail: thill@wildman.com